NEW SERIES: VOL. 3, NO. 6—MARCH, 1898.

THE THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

ISSUED BY DIRECTION AND UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.

For free distribution to members. The T. S. in America is not responsible for any statements herein. Published by the Theosophical Society in America, at 35 Nassau Street, New York City.
A. H. SPENCER, Acting President.

Each member is invited to send questions, answers to questions, opinions, and notes upon Theosophical subjects. When necessary, the various communications will be condensed by the editor. Members should be careful to write distinctly and on one side of the paper only.

In sending questions, or answers to questions, whenever an assertion is made that such and such is a "teaching" or that "it is said in Theosophical literature," and the like, the name of author, article, volume, and page referred to must be given.

All communications should be addressed to **The Editor, Theosophical Forum, Room 1411, 35 Nassau Street, New York City.**

Entered as second-class matter at New York, N. Y., Post-office, July 25, 1895.
Issued monthly. Sent directly to each member. No losses by mail made good.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

QUESTION 108.

Is autonomy necessary in T. S. If so; why?

J. W. L. Keightley.—Autonomy, or self-government, is necessary to Nature and to Man. As Nature is governed and controlled by her own laws, laws which are self inherent in the Soul of Nature (for is not all Nature ensouled?), so man, in his turn, must attain to the government of himself, such control being at the behest of his diviner being. Now we find that outside control is injurious to Man, in direct proportion to the plane upon which that control mainly takes effect. Imprisonment of the body is harmful to the body. Control of the nervous body by means of drugs, stimulus or paralysis by means of alcohol, all act injuriously upon that "astral" body. Control of the mind, by means of hypnotism is of most pernicious effect upon that plane. All of these "controls" act and react upon planes other than that upon which the "control" first takes effect. All amount to the same thing; they rob the mind of its control of its instrument and of itself. Thus mind is the injured party, and mental evolution being the purpose of Nature—meaning

the evolution of "the human soul"—we see that Man must attain to his own self-government, or his autonomy. This does not mean that he is to become an isolated or separate being. That is not possible, indeed. It means that the final goal of Man and of Nature alike is to come under the control of The Self—themselves.

In the same way the T. S. based upon Universal Brotherhood and entire mental freedom, was intended to be the training ground of minds, and the only one known to our civilization where no doctrine or form of belief is put forward. Each mind can and should receive help from within itself and should aspire to reach that help, in order that the T. S. may be governed, as it were, by the collective minds of its officers and members. Any attempt at "authority" would deprive the T. S. of the operation of its Collective-Mind.

J. D. Buck.—Autonomy is to a corporate body what responsibility and relative freedom of action are to the individual.

There is a realm of moral responsibility surrounding every individual. While it is true that no one can be entirely free and independent, to deny these factors in human life altogether is to make one a mere machine, while he who deprives another of all freedom takes upon himself the responsibility of that other's acts. This is just what the Guru does, to a large extent, in the case of an *accepted* Chela. Hence the law of obedience which does not otherwise obtain. External organizations differ from occult, as the physical body differs from the spiritual soul. The grand object of individual life is the building of character, and the essentials of character are knowledge, goodness (altruism) and power; and as these can only arise from action as already shown, action must be as free as possible, else there is no proportionate responsibility and no character evolved. The two extremes of freedom or independence, and vassalage or absolute constraint, are equally opposed to the building of character. These are but the "pairs of opposites."

The T. S. was designed to be, always has been, and should always remain an autonomous body for the ethical and philosophical reasons above named. But even beyond these reasons are others. The Society includes people of every form of religious belief, and of none, with the sole requirement of belief in Brotherhood as essential to membership; its autonomy is but another name for that freedom and toleration which Brotherhood guarantees. The autocracy of any individual is as repugnant in such a body as the "orthodoxy" of any creed. These are the two concessions each one makes so far as the organization

is concerned, relegating them to the "reserved rights" which Brotherhood also guarantees to every individual. Brotherhood has never obtained, and never can, where either autocracy or creed are insisted on. These are irreconcilable paradoxes. Hence autonomy and Brotherhood are synonymous.

A. P. Buchman.—Webster defines Autonomy as the power or right of self government, etc. No matter whether this rule of action is applied to the individual or to a collection of individuals forming an organization, it favors and encourages growth and advancement which ultimately will bring out a newer and better civilization. It insures to the individual, to the society, to the state, to the nation, the largest range of liberty bounded alone by the law of toleration. Without the liberty vouchsafed by Autonomy, Toleration becomes extinct and Might ascends the throne. The initial lesson taught by Autonomy is that the individual must learn how to govern himself. To get this lesson he must, of necessity, know who "the self" is. This every one must appreciate for himself. Then how "the self" acts—here he must know something about the law of opposites. The schooling of self mastery can only be carried on successfully when one is left to rely upon a development of the thinking self for himself. Autonomy and Autocracy are opposite poles of one force. Autonomy aggregates, builds up, harmonizes and consequently reaches out for a realization of nature's highest ideal. Autocracy disintegrates, tears down, fosters hatred, bigotry, intolerance, dogmatism and all that is inimical to the best interests of man, individually and collectively.

A. H. Spencer.—Anything which cannot live by virtue of its own strength, and which is dependent upon the wisdom or virility of another is, consequently, a mere fungus, of short life and poor quality. "Autonomy" which in this connection seems to mean, completeness of all parts leading to a perfected machine, is necessary to the T. S., if the latter is to be a permanency. So at the recent Chicago Convention the effort to emphasize "Autonomy" in the T. S. was a struggle for the very existence of the Society as the event proved. The majority of the Convention having set their faces against "Autonomy" without, so far as I can see, perceiving the real issue at all, rushed headlong into measures, which by their own admission, would make of the T. S. A. a mere adjunct or fungus of another organization. The fact that some of its sober minded

members were able to prevent this attempt, may go to show that the T. S. A. was autonomous after all.

Maude Ralston.—The first object of the T. S. is to form a nucleus of universal brotherhood. This would be impossible without autonomy of action, which alone produces individuals. Brotherhood is not an accomplished fact on this plane, as regards either consciousness or action, from lack of individuals understanding their especial responsibilites. Any possible connection with the Universal Oversoul comes but from the centre, from within. It takes *every* color *truly itself*, from the standpoint of this plane to form the One White Light. Homogeneity on this plane means only disorder, chaos and rebellion.

J. H. C.—The right to self-government is inseparable from the obligation of karmic responsibility. It is not by subjecting himself to the judgment and will of another, that the individual accomplishes his moral, mental and spiritual evolution; but by exercising control over his acts, proportioned to his perception of and regard for their consequences. And this law must apply equally to an aggregation of individualities creating for themselves, by their association, a common Karma, as to an entity working out his own salvation. Freedom is essential to progression, as subjugation is productive of retrogression. It is worthy of remembrance that the wise founders of the Theosophical Society were so mindful of the absolute necessity for freedom in individual action that they allowed in their requirements for membership the widest possible latitude compatible with any formal organization. Avoidance of dogmatic affirmation of what they knew to be the highest truths was the best practical evidence of how far they deemed it wise to go in fostering the spirit of independence which, when conjoined with consciousness of responsibility, raises human thought and purpose to the highest plane. "Think for yourselves;" "Do what you see as right;" "Believe nothing your reason does not approve;" "Be chary of seeking to control the actions of others, lest you share their karma;" were among the things they reiterated to those who sought their advice. Does any one recall that the great-souled and intellectual H. P. B. ever indulged in self-glorification as a Pythoness? Or that our noble, self-sacrificing friend W. Q. J. ever assumed to be a Pope for the governance of Theosophists? "Learn to stand erect; to rely upon yourselves; to govern yourselves" was what they taught, —not "Believe in Me, only in Me, and Do as I say, for only through Me can ye be saved."

Question 109.

Is denunciation ever a duty?

A. H. Spencer.—I think there may be cases where it is. If a man is believed to be about to commit a destructive act, or is known to be a chronically dangerous person, the public or at least that part of it concerned is entitled to a warning. Also if an act has been committed, the evil consequences whereof might be alleviated by the identity and character of the perpetrator being known, it may become the duty of someone to denounce these. If by "denunciation" the above is meant, then I should say "yes" to the question on broad general principles, but even in such cases, the greatest care and discrimination are necessary to divest the act of denunciation of the quality of retaliation or an unwholesome sense of self-righteousness. When however denunciation takes the shape of calling names, such as "fiend," "black magician," "animal," etc., the denunciator is not only exhibiting bad taste but gets himself on dangerous ground, in this regard, viz: that his own thoughts must of necessity partake to some extent of the horrible qualities he fancies in the other person and the reaction upon himself is no less inevitable than disagreeable. Those whose thoughts are not more or less fiendish at the time, are not apt to see fiends. And so on. It is very easy to drift into the idea that we are on general police duty, and thus become over officious in ordering people to "keep off the grass." The incidents of the time of Cotton Mather and the people who "denounced" witches are repeated in some shape or other in every generation. Let us keep our own lives as free from guilt as possible and denunciation by or against us will seldom be our portion.

J. W. L. Keightley.—It can never be right to "denounce" or to "condemn" any man, be he fellow Theosophist or not, in the sense of a harsh, critical, or needless exposure of his acts. Above all, it is never necessary to attribute a motive to these acts of his, for that is to condemn the man himself. But it is often necessary to state dispassionately the nature of certain acts, which are harmful to others and where silence would entail injury to those others. And it is sometimes the duty of the agents of the law, whether human law or ethical law be meant, to point out very clearly the tendency of given actions. In the case of human law, its agents must, under present karmic conditions, provide for the carrying out of the verdicts of that law. Whatever might be their individual

opinions, to resist the human law, entails more discord and suffering upon mankind that can be balanced by any mental attitude maintained. But the ethical laws, which are really the spiritual, execute themselves and are called to this function by the sinner himself.

It would also seem to be within the province of the just man to refrain from denouncing a fellow creature whom he had discovered in the act of violating the law made by men. The same is true—and even more often true—of the ethical offender. The danger to the welfare of others must be the determining factor. But compassion and calm may inform the act of him who brings the actions of another to justice; he is bound to see that the wrong acts are brought to an end even while he extends a divine pity and hope towards the man who offends.

A. P. Buchman.—To assume that it is my duty to *denounce* the acts or words of a brother—of a human being—is, at once, to arrogate to myself the attributes of a dictator, without fault or blemish. It is written that it is better to remove the mote from one's own eye than to see the beam in your brother's. Again, the golden rule "do unto others as you would have others do unto you" enunciates a doctrine at variance with the idea of denunciation. To find fault, to denounce, is to live on a low plane where assumption, and arrogance, and ambition, hatred, and pride, and vanity, and fear govern the action. All these attributes are in direct opposition to selflessness and charity, and benevolence and all the other actuating principles of our divine nature.

Thus we at once see that denunciation is not a duty, not even a privilege but is a dangerous practice, and can only be indulged in to the detriment and ultimate destruction of the practitioner.

J. H. C.—"Is denunciation ever a duty?" Yes, emphatically. Not to denounce evil is to become a sharer in guilt. It is cowardly to refrain from condemning that which our reason assures us is wrong, especially when the object of the wrong is the moral and spiritual degradation of the innocent and credulous. When it shall be improper to warn a blind man of a pit-fall in his path, or guard a child against a venomous serpent, then will denunciation of things worse than pit-falls or serpents cease to be a duty.

Maude Ralston.—There are sins of omission as well as those of commission connected with every act. In order to attain a proper mean between these two extremes it is necessary to stand

apart from prejudice and petty selfishness. To the extent that this attitude is possible the line of duty as regards denunciation, in any particular situation is made clear. To the extent that one recognizes his duty in denouncing the wrong in his own thoughts, words and deeds, is he capable of discerning truth about denunciation, then whether a shameful wrong be perpetrated against his own self or another's, is he prepared to act.

G. L. G.—A strange question indeed to be asked after all these years of the preaching of theosophical ethics and the striving to form a nucleus of brotherhood! Yet that its answer is needed, more to-day perhaps than at any other time in the history of the T. S., there are many of us to testify. However, we fortunately have a very full and elaborate answer made by H. P. Blavatsky, whose word on any theosophical subject is sure to receive careful and studious attention. This answer is contained in an article in *Lucifer*, vol. III., p. 267, entitled "Is Denunciation a Duty?", and no one after reading it can remain in the slightest doubt as to the opinion of this great exponent of theosophy on the subject. According to this article there are two *sine qua nons; we may not listen to evil, we may not condemn;* and in what evil listening and condemnation consist is clearly given, so clearly that no one can escape the conclusion. She closes thus: "Not only this, but if we would not have our society become, *de facto* and *de jure*, a gigantic sham parading under its banner of 'Universal Brotherhood'—we ought to follow every time the breaking of this *law of laws*, by the expulsion of the slanderer. No honest man, still less a theosophist, can disregard these lines of Horace:—

> 'He that shall rail against his absent friends,
> Or hears them scandalized, and not defends;
> Tells tales, and brings his friend in disesteem;
> That man's a KNAVE—be sure beware of him.'"

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION.

FOR THE USE OF BRANCHES.

The following subjects are supplied as being suitable for discussion at branch meetings. They are by various students who have had experience in conducting such meetings. It should be clearly understood that statements made herein are *suggestions for discussion*, are not official, nor in any way authoritative. Similar outlines will be gladly received by the editor, who reserves the right to make such alterations in their construction as may seem advisable.—EDITOR.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT IN THE 19TH CENTURY.

Society founded November 17th, 1875. Early opposition from without. Attacks against H. P. B. Spread of the work throughout India and Europe. Character of the work. What was it for? Many members leave when Madame Coulomb slandered H. P. B. H. P. B. in London ; W. Q. J. in New York.

Annie Besant slandered W. Q. J. Effect of this as once more reminding members of an important and fundamental principle. Reorganization of T. S. in 1895. Present test of members in relation to the principle of Brotherhood. How does this test differ from previous tests, if at all?

REFERENCES:

Old Diary Leaves, Chaps. viii and ix. The Path, Vol. iii, p. 143 ; Vol. vi, p. 78 ; etc.

KARMA.

A universal law. Its action generally admitted theoretically. Why do not more people believe in it actually? Is it because they "cannot wait"? Is it because the lower nature desires to over-ride Karma to see its own will enforced? If the higher nature at all times surrenders to the law, why is it that the lower nature rebels against it? The duty of man to accept the decrees of Karma and yet to use its effects for the best.

REFERENCES:

Key to Theosophy, p. 201. Ocean of Theosophy, Chap. xi. The Path, Vol. v., p. 374 ; Vol. iii, p. 94, p. 293 ; Vol. vii, p. 157.

IS DENUNCIATION A DUTY?

Difference between denouncing an act and the actor ; between denouncing the private acts of persons and their public or official acts. Why it is wrong to judge or condemn motives. The recoil which follows such procedure. The difference between the public denunciation of an official act and gossip or privately circulated slander. The duty of those who hear slanderous statements made. The importance of this subject in the light of Theosophy and as bearing upon brotherhood. The difference between the worldly view of this subject and the theosophical view.

REFERENCES:

Lucifer, Vol. iii, p. 267 "Is Denunciation a Duty?" The Path, Vol. iv, p. 98. Present FORUM.

MASTERS OR ELDER BROTHERS.

Do Masters exist? As living men or abstract possibilities? Proofs of their existence as men. A necessity of evolution—analogy—direct testimony. Why they are not officially recognized by the T. S. What constitutes a Master? Is he one who has unified himself with the oversoul, so as to now live and function consciously upon the soul plane? If so, must he not act in accord with the soul's laws? The limitations of their activity. Do Masters ever act against Karma? Do they ever do more than focus it or adjust conditions? What would constitute an order from such a being? Is it conceivable that any order from the oversoul could be meant for us, that was against the dictates of our higher natures? Do the Masters ever give orders? Do they ever do more than show a need and suggest an action? What should be our attitude towards them? Should we obey them? What would constitute true obedience to one who typifies the oversoul? Would it not consist in being true to our own soul and in following its dictates? Would it be possible to surrender to another, no matter how great, a man's individual responsibility? For what purpose are Masters working among us? Is it to aid man to a knowledge of his innate godhood and to help him to his true estate? If so is it thinkable that a Master of Wisdom would accept the surrender of a man's individuality, a surrender equivalent to moral and psychic death?

Is it not through the force of his individuality properly applied that a Master becomes such?

REFERENCES:

The Path, Vol. viii, pp. 65, 215, 306, 339, 381. Vol. ix, p. 52; Ocean of Theosophy, Chap. i.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

For general information I beg to state that the T. S. A., as an organization, was not affected in the least degree by the attempt at the recent Chicago Convention to betray it into the hands of a society called "Universal Brotherhood." Its official staff is, perforce, somewhat changed, Messrs. Buck, Buchman and Spencer of the old Executive Committee remaining, and Messrs. Ludlow, Coffin, Harter and Main having been substituted for Messrs. Neresheimer, Anderson, Pierce, and Patterson, who abandoned their offices.

At a meeting of the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York on March 8th last the "Leader and Official Head" of "Universal Brotherhood" announced that by virtue of her office as such she had decided to change the name of the T. S. A. to the "Theosophical Literary Association of the World" which of course is nonsense, but at least proclaims the intent of the whole proceeding. The T. S. A. will go right on as heretofore and all persons who were members thereof before Convention continue in their membership except such as have abetted or approved its attempted destruction at the Chicago Convention or since.

Suit has been entered in the Supreme Court of the State of New York against Katherine A. Tingley, and E. August Neresheimer for the recovery of the moneys, documents, archives, seal and other properties belonging to the T. S. A. which are now under their control. Pending the settlement of this question in the courts we are deprived of the use of the registers, correspondence, etc.; and as our lists are old and very incomplete, it is quite probable that our publications will not reach all members. Therefore, it is hoped that those who receive this advice will assist in promulgating the information herein contained amongst such of their friends as may not have received it.

In regard to the formation of Branches, etc., it should be understood that wherever five or more persons in a Branch decide to remain as T. S. A. members, that Branch continues intact as heretofore and rightfully in the possession of such remaining members. Where less than five members are left these should form a group or center of their own and advise this office to that effect. It is especially desirable that all persons who intend to continue with the old T. S. A. should at once send in their names and addresses.

Attention is also called to the communication of Mr. George E. Harter, published herewith, referring to his plan of collecting funds for the support of the Society. This system was until recently suc-

cessfully carried on for several years, and seemed to meet with universal approval. THE FORUM cordially and heartily recommends the same to all members and trust that they will also send to this office such special contributions as they can afford to make, to provide for present unusual expenses.

A. H. SPENCER.

THEOSOPHICAL NEWS AND WORK.

A large number of resolutions have been received from loyal Branches all over the country. From the following among others: Dayton, Staten Island, Lowell, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Brooklyn, Upasika of Brooklyn, Washington, Nashville, New Orleans, Sandusky, Columbus, Massasoit of Providence, R. I., Houston T. S. of Houston, Texas, Yonkers, N. Y., Waltham, Mass., Louisville, Chrestos of Colorado Springs, Harmony of St. Louis, Chelmsford, Middleton, Detroit, Des Moines, Memphis. As these resolutions are all more or less alike, only a few are printed, those being selected which seemed to cover best the main points at issue.

These resolutions are from Branches where a *majority* of the members repudiated the actions of the Convention at Chicago. The *minorities* in the Branches throughout the country are organizing as rapidly as possible, and will be noticed later.

At a regular meeting of the Members of the Nashville Theosophical Society, held on Wednesday evening, March 2, 1898, there were presented for consideration the following

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTIONS:

The Nashville Theosophical Society was founded on April 22, 1895, for the specific purpose of undertaking Theosophical work on the general lines suggested by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge. And since its organization it has to the present time continued its uninterrupted work.

Upon the organization of the Theosophical Society in America, the Nashville Theosophical Society, while maintaining its own integrity and autonomy, became an integral part of the said Theosophical Society in America, and accepted fully, in letter and spirit, its broad and generous Constitution.

In all its work, the Nashville Theosophical Society placed especial emphasis upon those words of the *Constitution* under which it labored, which read:

"This Society is an integral part of the international Theosophical movement which began at New York in the year 1875."

"The principal aim and object of this Society is to form a nucleus of Univeral Brotherhood."

"Any person declaring his sympathy with the first object of the Society may be admitted to membership as provided in the By-Laws."

"Every person has the right to believe or disbelieve in any religious system or philosophy and to declare such belief or disbelief without affecting his stand-

ing as a member of the Society, each being required to show that tolerance of the opinions of others which he expects of his own."

"Each Branch may make its own By-Laws and manage its own local affairs in any manner consistent with this Constitution."

"This Constitution may be altered or amended at any Annual Convention of the Society, by a two-thirds affirmative vote of all delegates present and voting, *provided, that due notice in writing of the amendment proposed shall have been filed with the President at least three months before the Convention, who shall send to each Branch printed notification of such proposed amendment at least two months before the said Convention.*"

In consideration of the foregoing statements, and

Whereas, At a Convention of the Theosophical Society in America, held in Chicago, Illinois, on the 17th and 18th of February, 1898, certain members thereof did violate the plain letter of the Constitution in manner as set forth below:

1. They did introduce into the Convention, *without the required two months' notification to Branches*, legislation which not only tended to amend our Constitution, but to obliterate our whole Society as an autonomous body.

2. They did take from the individual Branches their vested right of self-government.

3. They did ignore that portion of our Constitution which states that merely sympathy with the first object of the Society is sufficient qualification for membership.

4. They did adopt legislation to the effect that one person may, without explanation, arbitrarily expel from the Society any person whomsoever—utterly repudiating that law of our Society which states that *no* member shall be removed save by the *unanimous consent of the Executive Committtee, after due trial.*

5. *By methods the most questionable*, in Convention assembled, they did *absolutely prevent* free discussion of *vital* questions affecting our Society, thus openly insulting chosen delegates—their brothers—unmindful of the *greatest rule* of our *Constitution* by which every member is "required to show that tolerance for the opinions of others which he expects for his own."

They do now intend to foist upon us an un-American, un-Theosophical autocracy, arrogating temporal as well as spiritual authority, under the false appellation—"Universal Brotherhood."

By these acts, and by political chicanery and falsification of the gravest character are we unwillingly forced to the painful conviction that many trusting Brothers were designedly betrayed by those in whom they had placed confidence.

Therefore, In view of all this, and reposing confidence in the Truth in Theosophy, and in the teachings left to us by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge, be it

Resolved, that the Nashville Theosophical Society does in no uncertain terms, declare the acts of the Chicago Convention, held on February 18–19, 1898, to be be illegal, null, void, and of no effect.

Resolved, That the Nashville Theosophical Society does hereby reaffirm its confidence in and allegiance to the Constitution under which it has been working.

Resolved, That the Nashville Theosophical Society continue its present form of organization and proceed in serene confidence with its Theosophical work.

Resolved, That the Nashville Theosophical Society proclaims its good will and fraternal feeling toward all students of Theosophy, and especially toward all

Branches of the Theosophical Society in America, and invites their correspondence and co-operation.

Resolved, That the Nashville Theosophical Society, in order to make fully known its true position, does hereby direct that a copy of these Resolutions be sent to every Branch in America, and to all interested parties throughout the world.

The Resolutions, upon being read, were unanimously adopted.

I. M. DeHart, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTIONS

— of —

THE UPASIKA THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Adopted unanimously, February 28, 1898.

Whereas: No notice of proposed amendments to the Constitution having been given by the President to the several Branches of the Society, in the call for the Convention of the T. S. A., held at Chicago, February 18, 1898, therefore any amendments adopted by said Convention, in the absence of such notice, are unconstitutional and void; and

Whereas: Said Convention inaugurated a new Society called Universal Brotherhood—which the delegates had undoubted right to do as *individuals*, but not as *representatives* of the T. S. A., having received no instructions or authority to create an organization to supplant the existing Society—and adopted a Constitution for the same which abrogates the Constitution of the T. S. A., all of which action, as delegates of the T. S. A., was irregular and wholly without warrant of law, and is therefore in no degree whatsoever binding upon members and Branches of the Society; and

Whereas: The said Convention failed to perform the duty for which it was convened, the election of a President of the Society, and delegated not the *election* but the *appointment* of such President to *an officer* of the organization created by itself, in flagrant subversion of the Constitution of the T. S. A.; and

Whereas: By such unlawful action and inexcusable inaction the office of President was made and remains vacant; and

Whereas: Three of the Executive Committee forfeited and vacated their membership of said Committee by taking part in these revolutionary proceedings, which, if not resisted, would result in the complete dissolution of the cherished Association for which H. P. B. and W. Q. J. wrought and suffered and died; therefore—

Resolved: That the action of the delegates to the Chicago Convention who remained true to the trust reposed in them, in uniting to condemn such disregard of constitutional rights, and the action of the three loyal members of the Executive Committee in promptly filling the vacancies in their body and appointing a Vice-President and Treasurer for the Society, thereby preserving not only the autonomy but the very existence of the organization, meets with the hearty approval of this Branch of the T. S. A.; and further

Resolved: That we recognize the Executive Committee, consisting of Mr. Spencer, Dr. Buck, Dr. Buchman, Col. Ludlow, Mr. Main and Mr. Harter; and Mr. A. H. Spencer, Vice-President and Treasurer, as the only legally constituted officers of the Theosophical Society in America; and further

Resolved: That the Executive Committee be requested to call a Convention of the T. S. A. to elect a President of the Society in the manner prescribed by the Constitution.

Henry A. Bunker, President.

Edward Alden, Secretary.

Washington, D. C., February 25, 1898.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Blavatsky Branch of the Theosophical Society in America, at Washington, D. C., held Thursday evening, February 24, 1898:

Resolved, That the Blavatsky Branch, T. S. A., of Washington, D. C., having heard read the resolutions adopted by members of the Society at a meeting held at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., February 19, 1898, hereby heartily endorses their action :

Resolved, That inasmuch as the action taken by certain delegates at the convention of the Theosophical Society in America, at Chicago, on February 18, 1898, in attempting to change its constitution radically without giving to all Branches notice of proposed changes required by Article XI of the Constitution, was clearly unlawful, therefore the Blavatsky Branch declares that such action is utterly null and void, and without any binding force on this or any other Branch, even though the vote of any such Branch was cast in its favor at the convention:

Resolved, That a copy of these Resolutions be forwarded to every Branch of the Society, and to as many individual members of other Branches as may be deemed necessary.

GEO. M. COFFIN, *President*,
E. M. COLCORD, *Secretary*.
Blavatsky Branch, T. S. A.

At a regular meeting of the Fort Wayne Theosophical Society held on Thursday evening, March 10, 1898, there were presented for consideration the following Preamble and Resolutions:

Whereas; The Fort Wayne Theosophical Society as a Branch of the T. S. in A. sent its delegates to the T. S. in A. convention held in Chicago, Ill., on February 18 and 19, 1898, expecting and believing that the delegates in Convention then and there assembled would proceed in an orderly and becoming manner and conduct such business as would come before that body for consideration in strict accord with the organic law governing said body, and

Whereas; From personal observation and authentic published accounts of the acts of said Convention, we are in possession of unquestionable information that the Convention proceeded in a manner wholly and entirely disorderly and illegal in this, that, without warrant or due notice they attempted to legislate the T. S. in A. out of existence as an independent body and set aside its constitution and proceeded to make of it a literary annex to a new organization called the Universal Brotherhood then and there brought into existence, and

Whereas; In this action the vested rights of the Branches of the T. S. in A. were utterly and wantonly ignored ; that autonomy was declared null and void, and supreme autocratic control of Branches and everything in and out of sight placed in the hands of Mrs. Tingley ;

Therefore be it Resolved, That the Fort Wayne Theosophical Society does flatly and absolutely refuse to abide by the action of the Chicago Convention.

Resolved, That, the Fort Wayne Theosophical Society does hereby reaffirm its allegiance to the Constitution under which it has operated since the Boston Convention in April, 1895.

Resolved, That the Fort Wayne Theosophical Society continues its present form of organization and proceeds in the even tenor of its way refusing to be molested or hindered by Mrs. Tingley or any one else.

Resolved, That a copy of these Resolutions be sent to every Branch in America and to all interested points throughout the world.

These Resolutions on being read in open meeting were unanimously adopted.

NEW ORLEANS BRANCH

— of —

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.

No. 828 Canal Street, N. O.

Minutes of March 12, 1898.

Pursuant to adjournment the New Orleans Branch of the T. S. A., met in the office of its President, Dr. C. J. Lopez, at 828 Canal Street, on March 12, 1898, at eight (8) p. m. The President declared that the business before the meeting was the acceptance of the Charter of *Universal Brotherhood.*

A motion was made to accept the Charter of *Universal Brotherhood.*

A vote was taken and the motion was lost.

President Lopez then tendered his resignation as President of the New Orleans Branch T. S. A., also as a member of the Theosophical Society in America. Resignation accepted.

Four other members resigned from both the N. O. Branch and the T. S. A. Resignations accepted.

The Charter of the New Orleans Branch of the T. S. A. was then unanimously declared to belong to those members who had refused to become a part of *Universal Brotherhood,* and who were to continue as a Branch of the original T. S. A., under the present Vice-President, A. H. Spencer. Brother Mitchell was elected President and Brother Dunbar, Secretary.

The members instructed their Secretary to send a full account of the proceedings, and Minutes of said meeting, to Mr. A. H. Spencer.

Foreign News.—We are glad to advise our readers that W. A. Bulmer, who at one time published THE NORTHERN THEOSOPHIST, has stated that he will reissue the Magazine as soon as possible, and in the interests of those members of the T. S. in Europe who remain loyal to the Constitution and platform established by Mr. Judge. The magazine will be called *The English Theosophist.*

The general situation over there is very well described by the following letter:

"Let there be calmness: hold fast: go slow."—W. Q. JUDGE.

141 ALDERNEY STREET,
LONDON, S. W., 5th March, 1898.

DEAR COMRADE,

At the 156th regular meeting of the H. P. B. Branch of the T. S. in Europe, held on the 28th February, 1898, the majority of the members present in person or by proxy decided to "ratify" the action of their delegates at the recent special convention, and decided to abandon the constiution of the T. S. in Europe, and *ipso facto* to abandon the constitution of the H. P. B. Lodge, which is a body formed under the constitution of the T. S. in Europe. The minority, remaining members of the H. P. B. Lodge decided to continue the work of the Branch and Society as heretofore, and unanimously resolved in future to hold the regular meetings of the Branch, by the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Trood, at 78, Wigmore Street, London, W.

The 157th regular meeting of the H. P. Branch of the Theosophical Society in Europe, established autonomously on the 4th July, 1895, under the presidency of W. Q. Judge, was accordingly held at 78, Wigmore Street, W., on the 3rd March, 1898.

Present, 10 members and 4 visitors.

The election of officers in the place of those who had left the Branch was proceeded with.

The following resolution was moved by Mr. R. Trood, and seconded by Miss Cuer, and was carried unanimously:

Whereas at the Special Convention of the Theosophical Society in Europe, held at 3, Vernon Place, Bloomsbury, on February 23d, 1898, a majority of the dele-

gates then present supported an illegal and unconstitutional resolution abandoning the constitution of the Theosophical Society in Europe, abandoning the autonomy of that organization, and associating themselves with a new Society,, being a (so-called) "'Universal' Botherhood," ruled autocratically by Mrs. Tingley—therefore be it

Resolved, that this Branch of the free, autonomous and democratic body known as the Theosophical Society in Europe, protests against and repudiates the action of these delegates, the same being *ultra vires;* it reaffirms the autonomy of the Theosophical Society in Europe, and of its National Branches, and the entire freedom and unsectarian nature of its platform, and the individual moral responsibility of its officers to the members alone ; it pledges itself to continue the work of Theosophy in unalterable loyalty to the teachings of H. P. B. and W. Q. Judge, and to oppose by every means in its power consistent with its principle of brotherhood, intolerance, priestcraft, and dogmatism in every form.

The following resolution was moved by Miss Alice File, and seconded by Miss Ellen E. File, and was carried unanimously.

Whereas some members of this Society have deemed it to be their duty to abandon its constitution and become members of a new autocratic organization, recently established under the title of " The Universal Brotherhood " ;

And Whereas the majority of the founders of the H. P. B. Branch, and other members associated with them, have deemed it to be their duty to support the constitution of said Theosophical Society in Europe and the principles of brotherhood, freedom, autonomy, tolerance and democracy in government embodied therein and have unanimously agreed to continue the work of the Branch, and of the said Society, on the lines heretofore pursued ;

And Whereas the said Theosophical Society in Europe, in the year 1895, issued a proclamation of fraternal goodwill and kindly feeling towards all students of Theosophy, and members of all Theosophical Societies wherever and however situated, and further proclaimed its hearty sympathy and association with such persons and organizations in all Theosophical matters except those of government and administration,

Resolved that the H. P. B. Branch of the said Theosophical Society in Europe hereby reiterates the said proclamation.

Resolved that the members of the H. P. B. Branch of the said Theosophical Society in Europe hereby convey their fraternal greetings to all those their late colleagues in the said Theosophical Society in Europe who have seen fit to abandon this Society, and hereby express their unshaken conviction that all sincere work, regardless of creed and form, undertaken for the boundless Universal Brotherhood of which all manifested creatures are eternally members, and not for the glorification of any personality, will be acceptable to Those who watch over and protect the Theosophical Movement.

Resolved that copies of these Resolutions be sent to all whose addresses are known to the Secretary.

The feeling of the H. P. B. Lodge is that when members have had time to quietly consider the whole facts bearing on the recent *coup d'etat*, the trend of the writings of H. P. B., W. Q. J., and other Theosophists, published during the last twenty-three years, the essential difference between loyalty and partisanship and the Spirit which has animated the T. S. for so long, many will desire to continue to work with and in the Society on the lines indicated by H. P. B., and it is in view of this that the H. P. B. Branch considers it right to keep all members in touch with the proceedings in the T. S. as far as possible. The Branch will welcome back to membership without any kind of formality anyone who has at any time been a member.

Fraternally yours,

THOS. GREEN, *Hon. Sec.*

SUPPORT OF T. S. A.

As is well known to most members of T. S. A., the undersigned was appointed by W. Q. J., several years before his death, as Trustee of a perpetual fund for the support of the General Society and the carrying on of its work. So long as W. Q. J. was with us, the Fund was encouraged and grew, at one time reaching the very satisfactory aggregate of nearly $1200 per annum.

At the suggestion of several of our delegates at the Palmer House meetings, I have determined to revive the Fund scheme, believing that it will, alone, if properly understood, be amply sufficient to supply all demands.

The plan is, to establish classes, made up of persons who are willing to pledge themselves to Themselves to contribute certain stated sums per month, the sums ranging from ten cents to as many dollars as the means of each individual will allow, sums to be remitted to me, to be receipted for by me as Trustee, and to be subject to call by the General Treasury as needed.

Amounts pledged may be sent monthly, quarterly or annually, as best suits pledgers.

There is now in my hands a small sum contributed by former pledgers. As the greater part of this sum was contributed by those known to me to be loyal to the T. S. A., the same will be paid to A. H. Spencer, Treasurer. If any of those who have remitted since February 1 object, they will please notify me at once, and the sums contributed by them will be refunded by me.

G. E. HARTER,
Dayton, Ohio.

T. S. A. BUTTONS.

I have to offer the members a new T. S. A. button, bearing the seal of the Society, to be worn in lapel button-hole or as cuff-buttons, at 35 cents each. Every penny of profit goes to the general treasury T. S. A., and will be used for carrying on the Work. Price per dozen, $3.00, to Branches only, with the understanding that all profits go to T. S. A. Button is made of celluloid, in correct colors, on good rolled plate back.

G. E. HARTER,
Dayton, Ohio.

NOTICE.

Hereafter, THE FORUM will be sent only to those members of the T. S. A. who before the next issue, shall have sent their names and addresses to the Vice-President at 35 Nassau St., New York City. Members are also advised that the office does not possess a complete list of the members of the T. S. A. The list which has been used and the only one which was obtainable, was that furnished by 144 Madison Ave. to the editors of *Child Life* in the fall of '96. All who have joined the Society since then are especially requested to send in their names and full addresses. Non-members of the Society can obtain the magazine upon payment of 10 cents per copy, or it will be sent to their address for one year for $1.00.

The present number of THE FORUM was held back, awaiting the result of some legal proceedings which have been commenced with a view to regaining possession of the T. S. A. property and archives. Unfortunately there has been some delay in this, but it is hoped that the next FORUM will contain a full account of the affidavits, arguments, and other papers.